

repealing the so-called anti-alien land law, the State's congressional delegation urged today in a bipartisan, joint statement.

All legally admitted immigrants are entitled to be free to purchase land. Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON, Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, and Congressmen DON MAGNUSON, THOMAS PELLY, THOR C. TOLLEFSON, JACK WESTLAND, and WALT HORAN declared.

They pointed out that the 1959 Washington Legislature had unanimously voted to place the constitutional amendment before the people.

In their joint statement, lawmakers said: "We feel that the resident Japanese aliens who contributed so much to the development of our State and of our country, and whose native-born American citizen sons fought so courageously in both the European and the Pacific Theaters of World War II in spite of bigotry and persecution, were not only treated unfairly by this law which will be repealed by an affirmative vote, but they also earned the right to dignity and decency."

Washington's representatives in the Senate and the House said they "urge the repeal of this antiquated statute that can no longer be used against those against whom it was directed because of corrective national legislation on the subject."

Their statement concluded: "for fair play, for equality, for justice, as Americans and citizens of the State of Washington, join us in voting 'yes' on Senate Joint Resolution 4 on November 8."

#### AUTHORIZATIONS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SUBMIT REPORTS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business be authorized, during the adjournment of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, to file with the Secretary of the Senate a report entitled "Dual Distribution in the Automotive Tire Industry," and that the report be printed along with any individual, supplemental or minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business be authorized, during the adjournment of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, to file with the Secretary of the Senate a report entitled "Government Procurement, 1960," and that the report be printed along with any individual, supplemental, or minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK—PAUL STRACHEN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday the Post Office Department issued a stamp commemorating the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I am delighted to see the Post

Office Department take this action giving recognition to the program of employment of the physically handicapped, and the dedication of a week each year to that program. I take special pride in it because I was the author of the resolution that established the National Employ the Handicapped Week, and it has been continued in good fashion since.

At the time the resolution was agreed to, a man in Washington, who was himself physically handicapped, headed an organization that worked very hard for the physically handicapped. He was on the brink of death at one time, and it was believed that he would never be able to survive. However, he pulled through. Many Senators and Representatives will recall the man to whom I refer. He is Paul Strachen.

Paul has left Washington and is now living in Florida. I believe no one had more to do with initiating, working for, pushing through, and bringing to final fruition the movement to show some interest in the employment of physically handicapped persons than did Paul Strachen. I believe it is only fitting that on the occasion that this commemorative stamp is issued we should remember the very fine, efficient and effective work that was done by Paul Strachen. He deserves a great deal of credit for what has been accomplished over the years.

A great deal has been accomplished. Physically handicapped people who in former days would not have been thought of in connection with gainful employment have been employed by the thousands throughout the country. We owe a great deal to Paul Strachen. I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut. Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the proviso that the Senator from Connecticut will not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF THE BILATERAL AIR AGREEMENTS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a statement I sent today to the State Department and to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON  
I want to commend the Department of State and the CAB for taking what I understand to be a step recommended by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its report on International Air

Agreements in 1956. Our committee called on the executive branch to enforce the bilateral air agreements. It has taken a long time and the action is long overdue but we are glad to see that some action is finally being taken.

I have reference to the report in the Aviation Daily for August 29, 1960, which indicates that the United States has initiated capacity consultations with the Scandinavian governments. The purpose of these talks will be to review the operations of the Scandinavian airlines to and from the United States to see whether they conform to what is justified in the international air agreements.

Unless prompt, vigorous, and effective action is taken by our Government, our airlines will be driven from the skies.

We do not threaten the legitimate operations of foreign airlines. There is enough traffic for all—if each operates in conformity with its solemn international air agreements. But when a few operate in excess of what is authorized—they threaten the livelihood of our airmen and the continued efficiency of our national flag lines.

Since the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee urged that the State Department and the CAB enforce the agreements more than 4 years ago, we wish them success on this precedent-making occasion, when for the first time in our aviation history, our Government has initiated capacity negotiations.

[From Aviation Daily, Aug. 29, 1960]  
LIMITS URGED ON SAS TRAFFIC TO UNITED STATES

American-flag carriers are urging that the U.S. delegation to the upcoming Scandinavian bilateral talks adopt specific limitations on traffic which SAS will be allowed to carry out of New York and Los Angeles. ATA President S. G. Tipton has told the CAB that U.S. negotiators should realize that "there is no possibility of getting the Scandinavians to agree to anything."

Tipton, who told the CAB that he spoke for all U.S. carriers except Panagra, said, "No matter how politely and carefully, in the last analysis the Scandinavians are probably going to have to be told what changes they must make in their scheduling policy. Unless the U.S. team goes to Copenhagen in this frame of mind, the whole consultation will not only be futile but it will be seriously damaging to the posture of the U.S. in other capacity consultations which must inevitably follow in the near future."

This is the first indication that the SAS negotiations are the first of a series to be held with foreign governments on capacity restriction. Some clue as to who the other airlines are is contained in an ATA table of "Fifth freedom operators." "Bermuda-type" operators says ATA, are those that carry mostly their own nationals or U.S. citizens traveling to or from the foreign flag carrier's own country.

ATA lists the transatlantic airlines, together with the percentage of legitimate "Bermuda-type" traffic carried, as "TWA, 95 percent; PAA, 93 percent; Lufthansa, 76 percent; Irish, 73 percent; BOAC, 72 percent; Air France, 62 percent; Swissair, 50 percent; Alitalia, 47 percent; SAS, 47 percent; Sabena, 33 percent; KLM, 31 percent." Commenting on these figures, ATA says "the SAS capacity is not primarily tailored to fit the traffic flow between the United States and the three Scandinavian countries."

The United States should require SAS to cut its on-season schedules in half and its off-season schedules by two-thirds, Tipton says. The recommended U.S. position assumes that SAS will retain 50 percent of the total air traffic between the U.S. and Scandinavia. "This is generous because it means that the U.S. flag carrier will carry substantially less than 50 percent—the balance go-

17070

ing partially or wholly by other carriers," Tipton says.

In addition, the United States should give SAS credit for "bona fide stopovers as being equal to 10 percent of their third and fourth freedom traffic. This generous allowance results in a figure 24 percent greater than the number of SAS 72-hour stopovers." SAS should also be allowed 30 percent of its total traffic for intermediate and transiting fifth freedom passengers, says the ATA, "even though such traffic of the U.S.-flag airlines on comparable transatlantic sectors probably comprises less than 5 percent of their total."

This proposed SAS limitation, says Tipton, "is not intended to suggest that either 70 or 90 percent is the correct figure for world-wide application. There is no such magic figure. We only say that these figures are reasonable for the sectors under discussion here." Tipton also points out that "it is extremely important to recognize the marked seasonal peaks and valleys of the trans-Atlantic market, i.e., to have one set of figures and conclusions for the on season and another for the off season."

The importance of the United States-Scandinavian talks is emphasized by Tipton. "From the airline standpoint, this is the first capacity consultation undertaken by our Government; the degree to which it is successful is certain to influence the attitude of our Government officials toward the similar consultations which must be held in the near future with the other countries which are also major violators of the Bermuda capacity principles," he told CAB Chairman Whitney Gilliland last week.

"It must be recognized that the Scandinavians will use every instrument of propaganda and political resistance at their command. As in the case of Dutch propaganda, the Scandinavians are trying to strengthen their position by claiming publicly that the U.S.-flag airlines are seeking to drive them off the Atlantic. We trust that the officials of our Government at all levels are convinced that the opposite is true. Our carriers are not opposing the right of the Scandinavians to compete on equal terms for the traffic between the United States and Scandinavia.

"It is the Scandinavians and other fifth freedom operators with low wage costs who would be pleased to drive the high-wage cost U.S.-flag operators off the international air routes—or at least to bring about such a heavy burden of subsidy on the American taxpayers as to weaken U.S.-flag efforts. Still worse, their continued assertion of their demand to operate untrammelled by the Bermuda capacity provisions simply puts the U.S. Government in the position of knowingly violating its obligations to its other bilateral partners who have a primary entitlement, with the United States, to the traffic between the United States and these other countries."

#### FREEDOM COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy for the training and development of leaders in a total political war.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on last Friday I called the attention of the Senate to the Freedom Commission bill which we are now considering, S. 1689. I expressed the hope then that, despite the brief time which remains to us, it would be possible to bring the measure to the floor for consideration.

I said I was confident that if the bill could be brought to a vote it would receive a great deal of support in the Sen-

ate. I joined my colleague the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MURPHY] in the belief that once the Senate had acted on the measure the House would promptly take parallel action.

It is encouraging that the majority leader, who is confronted with so many competing demands from so many sides, has nevertheless decided to bring the Freedom Commission bill before the Senate today. His action in doing so is a tribute to his vision and to the bipartisan spirit which he has always manifested on basic issues of foreign policy.

The Freedom Commission bill seeks to rectify what many of us consider to be the gravest deficiency in our national defense.

There are some who say that if we wish to be secure we must be prepared to spend more for defense purposes—and I agree with this view.

There are others who say that if we are to react intelligently to the Communist menace we must improve our policy-planning machinery—and I agree with that view.

And there are still others who say that if we wish to compete with our Communist opponents for the minds of men we must improve our society and grant the full measure of liberty to all Americans—and I agree. I am in most hearty agreement with all these views.

However, Mr. President, we could do all of these things and still lose the cold war—if we fail to recognize the total nature of the cold war, if we continue to fight it as amateurs against professionals, if we fail to give the representatives of the free world the same kind of intensive, broad spectrum training which the Kremlin provides for its adherents in every part of the world where it is still seeking to obtain power.

When I addressed the Senate last Friday I referred to the successes the Communists have had in such countries as Cuba, Iraq, Japan, and Guinea, and I pointed out that in every case these successes could be traced back principally to two things.

First of all, the Communists have learned the art of total warfare. They have learned how to combine the political, the economic, the psychological, the organizational, and the cultural into a single, integrated strategy of conflict.

Second, the Communists maintain scores of specialized training establishments, where they teach the art of total political warfare to revolutionary recruits from all parts of the world.

So long as the Communists have this advantage in strategic understanding, in training, and in organization, the free world will be helpless against them.

We could make no more fatal mistake than to underestimate the power of a single Communist professional, schooled in the tactics and strategy of subversion.

Among the several thousand men whom Castro had with him in the mountains, no more than several score, probably less than a score, were Moscow-trained Communists. But that handful of trained men were able to subvert a popular revolution and to give the Kremlin effective control in Cuba today.

American missionaries returning from the Congo were agreed that the violence

which broke out throughout that country immediately independence was declared was too well organized and too well synchronized to have been accidental or spontaneous. No precise arithmetical estimate may ever be available to us. However, I am convinced that in a country like the Congo, 50 trained agitators, distributed at key posts, would be quite capable of turning over the entire country to rape, mayhem, and chaos.

In his remarks before the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Detroit last February 22, Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, made some profound observations. I shall quote a few paragraphs:

Maybe many people in this country will be taught a new lesson in communism because Khrushchev, right at our doorstep, is applying his methods and techniques. He is perverting a revolutionary movement which initially had the support of some estimable people but which now is in the throes of a Communist takeover. Cuba is not the only country, though it is the one nearest to us, where such a process is underway.

Are we alerted fully to this kind of danger, and are we prepared to do all that we can to see that this development does not occur in a dozen or more countries elsewhere in the world?

This, today, is the major element of the Soviet scheme for world domination. We must understand it. We must analyze it, and through a well coordinated program of education and of action, protect ourselves against it.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the free world does not lack dedication. Of this I am utterly convinced. Nevertheless, so long as we have not developed the science of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy, so long as we do not have cold war professionals who have received intensive training in this science, just so long shall we remain helpless to cope with situations like those which exist in Cuba and the Congo.

The purpose of the Freedom Academy, under the Freedom Commission, is to fill, or attempt to fill, this gap in our defenses. By bringing together under one roof the best brains we have in our country for this purpose we shall be creating the kind of research facilities which have made possible our nuclear development program and our space exploration. In those fields we brought together the best talent available and put them to work, we provided them with facilities and equipment with which to work, and they have been and are producing results that could never have been achieved without a concentration of brains and effort.

At the same time as they engaged in the basic task of research, the Freedom Academy people would impart their knowledge and understanding to Americans and to the nationals of other free countries who come to the Academy for special training.

Mr. President, think how important that can be.

We must never permit ourselves to become fatalists about Communist progress. If we ever become fatalists about Communist progress, we shall be lost. The Communists can be defeated. As I said on Friday, it is not enough to out-

1960

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17071

gun them or outspend them. We must outthink them and outmaneuver them, and this can be done with brains. It can only be done on the intellectual level, and at no other level. In my judgment, only in that way will the struggle against communism ever be brought to a successful conclusion.

Day after day, in this body and in the House, men and women of high intention have been saying that this is a struggle for the hearts and minds of men. Indeed, it is. But while we have talked in these terms, what have we actually done to win the hearts and minds of men?

I do not suggest that the Freedom Academy would be a cure-all. I offer it as one suggestion, made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DODD]. They have proposed a plan which is positive, something which should be tried. If this is a battle for the hearts and minds of men, let us get into the battle on that level.

Let us start thinking, and let us get our best minds thinking. Let us place them in touch with each other. Let us provide them with a repository of the thinking of free people all over the world. Let them exchange ideas and expose themselves to the thinking of others. Let them analyze this knowledge, put the bits and pieces together, and come up with a carefully thought-out plan of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy.

Already many battles have been won against the Communists. I think we are inclined to overlook that fact. Let us remember the experience of the people in the labor unions of the Nation. The great trade unions and great labor unions have met the threat of communism head on in their own organizations. In instance after instance, labor has overcome communism. I cite that as a first-class example of the position that the battle against communism can be won. It has been done. It has been done by means of brains, organization, and dedication.

The leaders of the American labor movement did not outspend the Communists. Certainly they did not outgun them. But they outthought them and outfought them. Today, the influence of communism in the labor unions is so small as to amount to very little.

Mr. President, that is the kind of effort we are talking about. That is the kind of task in which we suggest a Freedom Institute can help so much.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who is a coauthor of the bill, and who has done so much to bring this matter before the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I asked him to yield so that I might substantiate what he has said in his words of commendation concerning what has been done in the American labor union movement to rid its ranks of any tinge of communism.

I point out that one of the early advocates of the Freedom Academy, about

which we are now speaking, and one of the great crusaders for such legislation, is Mr. Arthur G. McDowell, a prominent labor union official in the United States, who, in addition to holding a responsible position in the trade union movement, has been made secretary of the Council Against Communist Aggression.

Arthur McDowell has been a real tower of strength in pushing the proposed legislation to the point where it is today, and where it appears we shall have an opportunity to vote upon it.

Even though there remain only a few days—or perhaps only 1 day—in which the House can take action, I am confident that as a result of the type of support that has been generated from all over the Nation, in insisting that this Congress do something effective in this area, it will be possible for the Congress to act expeditiously, so this measure can be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I know of none who have done more or who are more intelligent in their attitude to the menace of communism than are our labor organizations. In my opinion, they have been far ahead of any other segment of our society on this score. The Senator from South Dakota is quite correct in what he says about Mr. McDowell; and I think we could easily name 100 or 200 other labor leaders who have been outstanding in this regard.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURRICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who is my personal friend, that I am puzzled about two aspects of the bill.

Upon reading the report, I note that the bill proposes the creation of a Freedom Commission which would establish a Freedom Academy, which would have the responsibility for training Americans, and selecting foreign students and training them, also, to better understand the nature of the international Communist conspiracy and to develop effective methods of combating it.

And the bill includes various provisions in regard to how the Commission and the Academy would function.

In the report it is stated that the Department of Justice is wholly in accord with the view that it is most desirable to develop throughout the world greater awareness of the operations of Communism and the methods of combating it.

But there are two aspects of this proposal that are puzzling to me. First I shall state them, and then I shall ask the Senator from Connecticut to comment on them.

First of all, I wonder how it is that this proposal was not handled by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, instead of by the Judiciary Committee.

In addition, I note that the report states that the Department of Justice is

unable to recommend enactment of this bill. In short, to be blunt about the matter, it would seem that the Department of Justice is opposed to the bill.

So I should like to have the Senator state his views on both of those points.

Mr. DODD. Let me take them up one at a time, if I may.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. DODD. As to the jurisdictional question, I do not know the complete answer. I understand that the Parliamentarian—or someone other than Senators, at any rate—handles the reference of measures to the Senate committees. The Freedom Commission bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee in April 1959.

We held hearings for 3 days, and heard approximately 20 or 30 witnesses—rather distinguished witnesses, I think it fair to say. All of them favored the proposal. No one appeared in opposition to it.

So with respect to the jurisdictional question, I can only say that the bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee—and properly so, I suppose, because this subject concerns the Judiciary Committee. As a matter of fact, I think it will concern many other Senate committees. Certainly, it will concern the Foreign Relations Committee. I suppose it will concern the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and also the Appropriations Committee, and perhaps others. Any undertaking of this kind will inevitably involve several of our committees, and I think it is good that this is so.

Originally, it was proposed that a joint committee be established, and that it, in turn, supervise the establishment and functioning of the proposed Academy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just now I was discussing the bill with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Let me ask whether printed copies of the hearings are available.

Mr. DODD. Yes. I believe they have been distributed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is none on our desks.

Mr. DODD. I am afraid I do not know what the machinery for their distribution is.

Mr. President, in my answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Ohio in regard to the matter of jurisdiction, I mentioned the Foreign Relations Committee and also the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Obviously, I should also mention the Committee on Government Operations. My understanding is that the Foreign Relations Committee probably would also have a great deal to say about the operations of the Commission and the Academy, once they became operational. I assume, also, that the Foreign Relations Committee would wish to make recommendations; and I assume that after the operations got underway, it would make suggestions for their improvement.

That is about all I can say in regard to the question of jurisdiction.

I am not an expert on the subject of committee jurisdiction, and I do not know the precise answer. But I do know that this proposal seems to be a good one. I have no personal pride in the measure, for, unfortunately, I am not either the author or a coauthor of this proposal. It was authored by others. It was brought to my attention only because of my membership of the committee. I believe the Senate rules were not violated when the measure was referred for consideration to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. As I read the bill and the report, I judged that the proposal deals completely and extensively with the foreign relations of our country. So I wondered why the measure was not handled by the Foreign Relations Committee. I thank the Senator for answering me on that point. Evidently we are all somewhat puzzled that it should be handled by other committees.

Mr. DODD. I do not agree it deals exclusively with matters within the jurisdiction of that committee. I think we have much to do to educate our people on this issue, and in a sense, I suppose, all these matters are foreign relations matters. So much of what we do is so. We do not live by ourselves at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, I would like to say for the Record that I believe the bill should have gone to the Foreign Relations Committee. It is primarily, I believe, intended to affect our foreign relations. I think the Department of State should be permitted to testify upon it.

Would the Senator from Connecticut tell me whether or not the Department of State appeared in connection with this bill and expressed its support of it?

Mr. DODD. I do not see any record of the Department of State as such. I do recall the names that appear in the list of the contents in the hearings are those of men who are well informed on the subject. But I do not see anyone specifically representing the State Department listed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me, under the Standing Rules of the Senate, which provide, among other things, that relations of the United States with foreign nations generally are within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee, that this bill is primarily in that field.

I grant there are many bills which affect various establishments of our activities and are not exclusively in one or another field; but I think, on the general principles which apply to this question, that the one which predominates has jurisdiction, and I believe this bill should go to the Foreign Relations Committee, where I certainly would propose that the Department of State and the Department of Justice would both be called as the experts in the executive department to testify upon the merits of this measure.

My own attention was brought to this bill only in the last day or two. It may be a very good bill, but I think my duty as

chairman of that committee impels me to suggest to the Senate that the bill be sent to that committee for its consideration.

Mr. DODD. I am sorry the Senator feels that way. I understand his concern. I wish this question had been raised a year ago. It would have saved us a great deal of time. We heard 20 or 30 witnesses. I do not think it was a secret matter on which the Judiciary Committee was conducting the hearings. I do not know of anyone on the committee who wanted to have it that way. I do not think there is any proprietary attitude in the committee itself on the subject.

Because the bill was referred to our committee, we did the best we could. I do not say we did all we could. It seems to me the public notice of the fact that the subject was up for consideration gave ample opportunity, insofar as any committee can give it, for others to appear and to raise the question of jurisdiction, if they felt it should be raised.

I am not one who is a stickler for technicalities, either here or in other places. If this is a good bill, if this is something this country needs, if it ought to be done, if it is a wise proposal, or seems to be such to the Members of the Senate, if it can contribute to a better understanding of the struggle we are in, of what great moment is it that the bill was sent to the Judiciary Committee instead of to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or the Committee on Government Operations, or the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Is not the really important thing that we should get on with the business and get it started and get it underway? Then several other great committees of the Senate can bring all their interest to bear upon the program. They can keep an eye on it and they can have much to say about what is done. That seems to me to be the most important point. I hope at this time we shall not be faced with a delay, which will necessarily result from referring this bill to another great committee of the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I hope my distinguished colleague and friend does not think I am resorting to a technicality.

Mr. DODD. Oh, no.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. But the fact is that I have been trying to obtain a copy of the hearings. I have a copy of the bill. I have a copy of the report. However, I have not as yet, after efforts late this afternoon and early evening, secured a copy of the hearings.

If the Senator from Connecticut has a copy of the hearings, may I ask whether a representative from the Department of Justice testified before the committee as I observe from the report? This statement carries great weight with me. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut. It states:

Accordingly, the Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of this bill.

I construe that statement to mean that, in reality, the Department of Justice is opposed to the enactment of

the bill. May I ask the Senator's views on that subject?

Mr. DODD. Yes; I shall be happy to reply. The committee wrote the Department of Justice, asking if it would like to present its views. The reply we got was in the form of a letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Walsh, and that letter is contained in the hearings.

I am very distressed that the Senator does not have a copy of the hearings. I do not want to plead ignorance all the time, but I am not familiar enough with the machinery here to understand why he does not have a copy of the hearings. I assumed a copy of the bill, report, and hearings would be on every Senator's desk. I should be glad to give the Senator the copy of the hearings which I have with me for his attention and study right now.

The Department of Justice wrote a letter, over the signature of the Deputy Attorney General, making the point, as I understand the letter, that the services to be provided by the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy were already available. That seems to be the principal strongpoint of the letter to the committee—namely, we already have it, and therefore we do not need a duplicate facility.

The best answer I can give to that is to quote very briefly from the testimony of Mr. C. D. Jackson, whose name is certainly known to all of us. He was a White House adviser on intelligence matters. He is thoroughly experienced in the whole business of psychological warfare and our efforts to overcome and to successfully resist the menace of communism. I quote from his testimony before the committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may repeat and paraphrase, I am sure that there is a general impression that adequate instruction places exist where this art or this profession can be studied.

I will say to my friend from Ohio that, of course, he was referring to the bill under consideration. Mr. C. D. Jackson went on:

Actually, sir, there is no existing place where the whole problem is pulled together and taught in concentrated form and not in bits and in pieces. That is why I think this is a good idea.

He added another sentence:

It is only by uniting the study and teaching of these elements in one place and one time that the challenge can be fully comprehended and adequate responses generated.

That is the best answer, I think, to those who contend that the facilities are already available. I think there are several places where one can learn some phase of the matter, but I do not know of a place where it can be learned whole. Mr. Jackson is an expert, and he ought to know better than I.

As the Senator from Ohio knows, the committee in its report made a statement, after hearing all of the witnesses and reviewing the matter not summarily or hastily:

No concentrated, systematic effort is being made to develop an integrated, operational science for our side which will meet the entire Soviet attack.



1960

The report goes on to explain at greater length.

I think it is sensible to say that we do not have a place where all this information is gathered together and where this kind of service, this kind of facility, can be made available, not only to our own people in Government and in private life, but also to nationals of free countries who wish to learn how to resist communism more effectively.

That is my answer to the question raised by the Deputy Attorney General.

I wish to conclude very briefly. I think the bill is eminently sensible. That is the first point I wish to make.

For many years all of us have heard that people have been saying: "We will never beat the Russians by scolding them, by arguing with them, and by calling them names"—which is all true—"we have to beat them on the intellectual plane."

As they generally put it, "We have to win this fight for the minds of men and for the hearts of men."

We have been saying all this—but this is the first time I have seen any concrete suggestion for implementing it. That is all this is. It is an effort to start using our intellects.

The second point I wish to make is that this program is urgent. Last week I tried to spell out why I thought it was urgent. I pointed out that our opponents in this struggle have been working at it for 40 years. They have all kinds of institutes throughout their empire. We have not one of this kind.

The third point is somewhat related to the second point. In my judgment, the time is desperately short. We have very little time.

For these three reasons it seems to me the bill merits favorable consideration by the Senate.

I can think of no more edifying way in which the Senate might conclude its affairs this year than by unanimous bipartisan action to establish the Freedom Academy, with both sides saying, "Let us try this, anyway. Let us get at the business of developing a scientific strategy to win this fight."

This is not a Republican measure. It is not a Democratic measure. It is a bipartisan measure. Those who urge it upon the Senate have never said—and I certainly have never said—it is the best or only plan which can be suggested. It is a plan—and one which ought to be tried if we are ever to win this fight.

I hope the bill will receive the favorable consideration of the Senate. If it does, I think there is still time to take it to our colleagues in the other body. If they will take the time to study it and to look at it, they, too, will agree that this ought to be done.

This plan should be tried. What can be lost by trying? What great setback will this Nation suffer if it sets up the Commission, and if the Commissioners try to set up, and do set up, an institute or academy in which communism and the counteraction to communism can be studied?

The dollars would be minuscule compared to what we are spending to outbuy

and outgun the Communists. Certainly there should not be any great feeling of regret about it.

All I plead for is a chance, for once, to do something positive, something direct, something affirmative, something to win the minds of men that we talk about so much, something to win the hearts of men that we talk about so much.

I hope the bill will be favorably considered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in regard to the Senator's statement that the bill will be sent to the House if it passes the Senate, two thoughts occur to me, about which I wish to ask my distinguished friend questions.

The statement is made, "Accordingly, the Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of this bill." That, to me, implies the Department of Justice of this administration is in reality opposed to the passage of the bill.

We are now in the closing moments of this session, which was supposed to be a "clean-up and get-out" session of Congress. We are, in a way, hoping that this is the night before the final night of this session. We are marking time, waiting, and hoping that a conference report will come in on the supplemental appropriation bill.

What basis is there for a belief, even if the bill were to pass the Senate and were to be passed in the House, that the President would sign it? The President has, in fact, vetoed so many bills that sometimes one thinks he takes a fountain pen with him on the golf course and vetoes bills between rounds of golf. What assurance is there to believe that the President would not veto this bill, particularly in view of the fact that the bill provides for the appointment of six members of a commission?

I was somewhat surprised to note, the provisions of the bill. I must say in all frankness to the Senator from Connecticut that I had not read the bill until late today. I thought this might be an honorary commission, with patriotic Americans contributing a large part of their time. Lo and behold, in reading the bill I learned the members of the Commission will be appointed for 6 years, for 4 years, and for 2 years, respectively, and after that for 6-year terms. Each member of the Commission is to receive \$20,000 per annum.

To a fellow like me, that seems like a great deal of money. In addition, the bill provides for expenditures by the commission.

I notice the chairman is to receive \$20,500 per annum, and the other members are to receive \$20,000 per annum.

There is an academy to be constructed and located.

Some other people would be employed; students, of course, would be employed and paid; and some other personnel are provided. I shall not take the time to cover compensation fully, but I noticed that \$50 a day is set forth as compensation. Those points lead me to believe that probably the bill, particularly in

view of the opposition of the Department of Justice and the expenditures involved, would face a veto by the President, even if we should pass it tonight and if the House of Representatives should also pass it in the closing hours of the session without amendment.

What basis is there for a contrary belief?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to try to respond. First, I do not know how anyone can ever say with certainty that the House will do this or do that. When I said that I thought the House would pass the measure, I made that statement because I believe in the measure. I think it would be good for the country. Because I believe that it would be good for the country, I must therefore believe that the House would pass it, if it has an opportunity to do so, and if it understands the measure.

With respect to a possible presidential veto, I assure my friend from Ohio that I am the least knowing of men in this body about such matters. I do not know what the President's mind is in respect to this measure; but if I were to make a guess, my guess would be that he would probably sign the measure.

The Senator may wish to know why I would make such a guess. Largely because of Mr. C. D. Jackson, who has been the President's close adviser. For 2 years he was special assistant to the President, and advised him on a subject very close to this proposal. He was a special assistant on cold war planning.

I do not know what the President would do. Anyway, I might add, we ought not to be concerned about vetoes.

I think this is a proper matter for consideration when we have legislation under discussion. However, when we are considering something that we believe to be right and good for the country, it seems to me it is our duty to pass the bill. We do not know the President's attitude, since he has not expressed it, nor has he expressed opposition. If the President sees fit to veto it, such action is within his power and proper jurisdiction. But I think it is as reasonable to assume that he will sign the bill as it is to assume that he will veto the measure.

With respect to the subject of salaries and expenses, let me say to my good friend, whom I respect and like so much, that I do not care if the Senator wishes to change the salary to \$10,000 or to \$15,000, or to raise it to \$30,000. In the battle in which we are engaged, in which many billions of dollars are being spent every year, it seems to me to be a small question whether members of the Commission should be paid \$20,000 or \$25,000. I do not believe that that is an important point.

If the men chosen to serve on the Commission are qualified and can do the work, I should like to see them adequately reimbursed. If the Senator believes that \$20,000 is too much compensation for a member of this important Commission, then I certainly shall not rise and say that it is outrageous. Twenty thousand dollars is a great deal of money to me, too.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut knows

17074

that I have on a number of occasions voted to override President Eisenhower's vetoes of needed legislation which we had passed. I would not hesitate to do so again. But I raise that question because of the expense involved, and principally because of the expressed opposition of the Department of Justice in this administration.

Mr. DODD. I understand my friend's attitude. I do not want him to think I am being harsh, because I do not intend to be. I have too much respect for him for that. But I wonder if, on reflection, the Senator from Ohio would not agree with me that \$20,000 is not a great deal of money today, when we ask a man to devote full time to such an important job as this would be.

I think we would be accomplishing the job at very low cost if we could get good people. I do not think we would ever be able adequately to pay qualified people for service on such a commission under our system. We should obtain people who have a sense of dedication and devotion and who would be willing to work for \$20,000 a year. I state my judgment. Even if we should pay the salaries set forth in the bill I do not think we would be paying them anywhere near what they would be worth.

Therefore I do not believe the money point is a serious block to favorable consideration of this proposal.

I would put the question of expenses in the same category. These questions seem to be small when compared with what we are attempting to do in so many areas in which the likelihood of success is not nearly so great as it is in this area.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Connecticut on a very profound and persuasive address and argument on a vitally important bill. I think every Senator recognizes that what he has been discussing, and what the proposed Freedom Commission would attack, is the crux of the problem in the free world today. What are we as free men going to be able to do effectively, short of war, to preserve peace and to preserve freedom?

So we are dealing tonight with a subject of great significance. We have an opportunity, at long last—late in the session to be sure, but not too late—for this Congress to distinguish itself by taking a great forward step in the successful waging of the cold war.

I am happy that the majority leader has vindicated the confidence which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and I expressed to him last Friday when we said that we were certain that he would bring the bill up for a vote in this session of the Congress. He has done so. Tonight we shall vote. Tonight the Senate will have an opportunity to express itself, as it should, on this vitally important subject.

The great Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in making its report on the subject, said on page 13 of the report:

The committee considers this bill to be one of the most important ever introduced in the Congress.

Mr. President, that is a pretty superlative phrase, a very strong phrase.

Congress has been meeting for a long, long while in the history of this country. But Congress has never met under the threat of a more urgent and virulent danger than it meets tonight on the verge of its adjournment, in an era when communism is running rampant in so many areas of the world. I do not really believe that the argument is whether the members of the commission should receive \$20,000 or \$25,000 or \$35,000, or whether the bill should be considered by this committee or that committee or some other committee.

One of the criticisms the Communists wage against free men is that democracy does not seem to be able to operate fast enough to meet a challenge on time. I hope the Senate tonight will not do anything to verify that kind of scurrilous attack upon the machinery of democracy.

I serve as the ranking Republican member of a committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], which is studying the machinery of the cold war. A great many witnesses have appeared before us. We have a very talented staff. We have been trying to determine what recommendation should be made and what changes should be made so that the administrative agencies of the Government in this cold war, can act more expeditiously, efficiently, and effectively to meet the challenges.

It is a proper exercise for Congress to undertake. However, if we bog down at this late hour by demonstrating that we lack, as a legislative body, the cold war machinery to act promptly to meet the challenge, if we thwart ourselves by having the bill shunted aside to another committee, to die a still death, while Congress adjourns, we will be guilty of the kind of inactivity in the legislature that we have created a committee to study and to criticize and to correct in the executive branch of the Government. We would in fact be exercising the errors that we established a committee to correct, if they exist, in the executive department.

I was greatly impressed by the closing comments of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], when he made three irrefutable points.

First is this legislation sensible? Certainly it is sensible to try to establish, through this form of commission, the machinery for properly training in the arts and skills and sciences of the cold war the people who represent America abroad. Certainly it is sensible to spend this pittance, when \$40 billion, half of the national budget, is being devoted to trying to do something effective to protect ourselves against Communism.

Certainly it is sensible to try a new idea. I hope that people are not afraid of new ideas. I believe that on occasion we must try something different, and I think we have reached that time. We have been spending money. We have been building armaments. We have been working in the area of mutual security, national defense, and missilery, and we are continuing to do all that. However, we have not been getting our quota of manpower and training and knowledge and know-how in order to

fight the cold war effectively, short of a shooting war.

It comes as no surprise to me that the bill has attracted support from every section of our American citizens. The Senator from Connecticut has correctly said that it is neither a Republican nor a Democratic bill; it is an American bill.

Its sponsors are from both parties. It is a bill which is not the creature of any segment of our economy. I have been interested by the list of witnesses who appeared before the committee. There is a long list of witnesses. The witnesses represent labor, industry, business, and the professions. They represent a great cross section of support for legislation of this type.

David Sarnoff, who has done as much as any other American to help activate machinery in the cold war, is one of the eloquent witnesses in support of the proposed legislation, and his testimony appears at page 39 of the hearings.

Andrew J. Biemiller, former Member of Congress from Wisconsin, with whom I served in the House of Representatives, speaks in favor of the bill at page 56. He speaks as an acknowledged, authorized representative of the AFL-CIO, whose endorsement he is authorized to present as a part of his testimony, at page 56.

Then there is the testimony of Mr. Jackson. He has already been alluded to, as has the testimony of Arthur G. McDowell, another prominent leader of organized labor.

So it goes, in and out of Congress.

I have in my hand an article written by David Sarnoff entitled "Turn the Cold War Tide in America's Favor." We all want to do that. We want to do it whether we have a commission which pays \$20,000 to its members, or \$25,000, or any other sum. We want to turn the tide of the cold war in America's favor, to avert a hot war.

It was printed as a feature article in Life magazine, which supported such a proposal long before this bill was introduced, and which has been advocating the establishment of a West Point of the Cold War, as it refers to a commission or academy of this type.

For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TURN THE COLD WAR TIDE IN AMERICA'S FAVOR

(By David Sarnoff)

The unfolding American debate on national purpose carries the disquieting implication that our traditional purposes, though they served the Nation well in the past, have somehow been outmoded if not wholly invalidated. This I do not believe to be true. I am convinced, on the contrary, that these time-tested purposes, rooted in the Nation's whole history, are more compelling than ever before. More, they are indispensable in enabling the United States to meet the paramount challenge of this epoch: the struggle between communism and freedom. If revitalized, redefined for our times and translated into great

1960

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17975

decisions, they could turn the tide of conflict in our favor.

The need now, as I see it, is not for tailor-made new purposes but for a renewed understanding and dedication to old purposes—raised to a dimension adequate for this fateful period. The need is for firm and inspiring positions commensurate with the immense perils facing our country and the human race.

The Communists, whatever their tactics in a given period, have never deviated from their purpose. It has been openly proclaimed from Lenin's day down to Khrushchev's and Mao Tse-tung's. It is, in the words of the official Moscow magazine *Kommunist*, "implacable struggle" looking to "the inevitable end of capitalism and the total triumph of communism." Such a challenge can be met and frustrated only with a purpose of equal scope.

#### MOUNT A POLITICAL COUNTERSTRATEGY AS MASSIVE AS THE ENEMY'S

Five years ago I submitted a memorandum to the White House sketching a program for a political offensive against world communism. "For Moscow," it said, "the real alternative to a nuclear showdown is not peace but political-psychological warfare of a magnitude to weaken, demoralize, chip away and ultimately take over what remains of the free world." The memorandum therefore urged that we renounce all delusions of easy solutions and compromises; that instead we mount a political counterstrategy as massive, as intensive, and as clear about its ultimate goals as the strategy of the enemy himself.

Events in the intervening years and intensified Communist pressures today have, if anything, fortified this point of view. The essence of my proposed program, for which I claim no originality, was—and still is—an unequivocal decision to fight the so-called cold war with a will and on a scale for complete victory.

The decision would have to be communicated to the entire world as boldly and energetically as the Communists communicate their intentions. Our message to mankind must be that America has decided, irrevocably, to win the cold war and thereby to cancel out the destructive power of Soviet-based communism. A national commitment of this scope, I submit, would be consistent with American instincts and experience, a restatement of historic purposes in contemporary terms.

The nature of those purposes has been sufficiently defined by the editors in the introductory article to this series. It is explicit in basic American documents, beginning with the Declaration of Independence, of which Thomas Jefferson could say, "We are acting for all mankind."

It is implicit in the widespread assertion—presented by some as an accusation—that our foreign policies have been "idealistic." Through the generations Americans have always thought of themselves as being in the vanguard of freedom. They cherished the image of their country as the citadel of democracy and morality and a living defiance to despotism anywhere.

The Rockefeller Bros. Fund report on U.S. foreign policy—prepared by a panel of which I was a member and published last year—put it this way: "The United States at its best has always seen its national life as an experiment in liberty \* \* \* [Americans] have known that the hopes of the world were, in some measure, bound up with their success. \* \* \* Whenever [the United States] has wielded effective power in the world, its ideals and its moral convictions have played a vital part in its decisions. Whenever, on the contrary, the United States has tried to act without moral conviction, or in ways that went counter to its basic beliefs it has found itself inhibited and has ultimately had to rechart its course. \* \* \*

Ideas and ideals are thus to the United States an essential element of reality."

#### WHY THE SHRINKING FROM LOFTY GOALS IN FAVOR OF THE SAFE, THE COMPROMISING?

This is why expediency and appeasement, solutions that condemn other peoples to enslavement, failure to react to international crimes, violate the deepest instincts of the American people. Why is there such a pervasive skepticism about our historic purposes and such a widespread search for substitutes? Why the shrinking from lofty goals for all mankind in favor of the safe, the compromising, or mere survival?

The easy answer—that it is all due to the advent of terrible new weapons—will hardly do. The calendar refutes it: The retreat began before those weapons were forged and grew more panicky during the time when America had a monopoly on the atom bomb. It was precisely in the years before Soviet Russia produced the bomb that communism scored its greatest gains, and it did so almost always by the default of the free world. The Soviet advantages were not military and technological but political and psychological.

The true answer, as I see it, is related to the ever-rising costs of idealism in terms of the sacrifices and the hazards involved. The trouble is not that the older purposes have become irrelevant but that they have become too relevant. I mean that the time when America could serve passively as an example or inspiration to other nations has run out. Today, professions of principle have serious consequences: they must be implemented in policy and action. To say it in slang, the time has come to put up or shut up.

As far as the contest with communism is concerned we had "shut up," quite literally. We had curbed our tongues for fear of offending the delicate sensibilities of those who daily offend us. Few democratic leaders dare to speak as uninhibitedly about the coming doom of the Communist empire as Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung regularly speak about our impending doom. Our opponents defy, denounce and challenge, while we plead and propitiate. We have left the vocabulary of confidence and victory to the other side, contenting ourselves with such evasive and temporizing words as accommodations, modus vivendi, relaxed tensions and coexistence.

This semantic timidity, of course, is merely a symptom and a minor one. The all-encompassing malady is a loss of nerve, marked by depleted self-esteem and purpose. It has impelled us, whenever we have been faced with a choice of interpretations on some aspect of the Communist affliction, to choose the more agreeable one, the one more conducive to complacency and less likely to tax our courage. With rare exceptions the choice has turned out to be the wrong and often the disastrous one, regardless of the political parties in power in this country and in the free world.

Thus in the 1930's we eagerly found assurance in Stalin's talk about "socialism in one country." Later we relaxed in the cozy conviction that the Chinese Communists were simply "agrarian reformers." We prefer to believe in the "evolution" of communism, though there has not been the slightest revision of ultimate Communist goals. We seek a comforting answer to our prayers in tensions between Moscow and Peking, though these are strictly within the framework of their unshakable alliance against the West, no more significant than Anglo-American tension within our alliance.

A familiar gambit is to list communism as just one item in a long inventory of problems. But if the Sino-Soviet bloc wins world dominion, the other problems will cease to matter; they will have been solved for the free world in about the way that death solves all bodily ills.

In the debate on National Purpose we find at least one area of virtually unanimous agreement. It is that sheer survival, in the elementary physical sense, is not enough. A nation which thinks and acts exclusively for self-preservation cannot, in the present-day world preserve itself. The posture, even if it were desired and desirable, has been turned into an anachronism by the surge of science and technology. The world has become too small for physical, economic or political isolationism. The polarization of forces dueling for supremacy has gone too far to permit the survival of an island of humanism in a sea of dehumanized totalitarianism. No single nation can survive unless the civilization of which it is part survives.

Our civilization, too, cannot remain isolated, confined to a delimited segment of the earth and indifferent to the humanity beyond those limits. The world cannot be frozen in its present patterns. In this period of great flux and of intermeshed revolutions, static, and passive arrangements are doomed to disruption. If the area of freedom is not expanded, then assuredly it will continue to contract.

Despite this, "survival of the free world"—side by side with an unfree world—has been and remains the maximum goal of Western diplomacy. Not the weakening and eventual defeat of communism but a lasting accommodation seems to mark the farthest reach of hope. It is scarcely a vision to inspire confidence or zeal, and in any case it is utterly utopian, because two parties are needed to make an accommodation.

The best analysis of Communist strategy that I know is in a recent book called "Protracted Conflict," by Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé of the University of Pennsylvania and three associates. The book's title is a phrase used by Mao Tse-tung. The Communist plan, say the authors, is protracted in time and space and in the limitless variety of its techniques and weapons, and the weapons can even include "the final and total knockout punch." Short of surrender, the authors see for our world no alternative but a many-sided, continuous, long-range counteroffensive.

Such a policy would reject all illusions of an enduring truce, let alone a negotiated division of the globe. The historic contest will be with us for a long, long time. We may delay, maneuver, bargain and compromise, but it will be so much flailing of water unless all such moves become for us—as they have always been for the enemy—calculated holding actions geared to long-range objectives, means not ends, tactics not strategy.

#### RISKS AND SACRIFICES CANNOT BE EVADED BY PIECEMEAL SURRENDERS

Whatever we do or fail to do in the years and decades ahead, we shall be forced to take great risks and make great sacrifices. These cannot be evaded even by piecemeal surrenders. In fact, if Americans and other free peoples are to understand and accept these costs and exertions, there must be some rational relation between the magnitude of the goal and the magnitude of the burdens it imposes.

This means that in the conflict with communism we must become the dynamic challenger rather than remain the inert target of challenge. Only then can freedom regain the initiative. Only then will we have a global goal to match that of communism, and the incentive to apply the full weight of our brains, energies and resources to its achievement. The great decision, once made and communicated to all concerned, will dictate its appropriate program of policy and action. The strategy will shape the necessary tactics.

Even the things we are now doing and must continue to do will become more relevant and more effective when geared to a conscious ultimate goal. Military and economic aid to our allies, to underde-

veloped areas and to neutral nations will cease to be hit-or-miss improvisations. They will be integral elements of an affirmative program. Propaganda, cultural exchanges, diplomatic moves, summit meetings will all acquire for us—as they always have for the Communists—dimensions of purpose beyond their limited immediate effects.

Before the Soviet Union attained its present technological stature, America's paramount problem appeared to be the struggle for men's minds. Today it is dangerous to concentrate on any one facet of the conflict. I think of the image in terms of a table with four legs, military, political, economic, and psychological. The significance of the last three is self-evident, since they relate to activities short of all-out war. But the military leg must not be underrated.

The present approximate balance of terror presents a false appearance of stability. But it may be upset. And if we relax in this area it will be upset. The enemy is constantly probing out vitality and resolution. Any one of these probes may lead to the brink of war and possibly to war itself. No matter how often we repeat that war is unthinkable it remains possible. War may be touched off by accident, or it may come because the Communist high command considers itself ready to deliver the "final and total knockout punch." The maintenance of adequate military power, both offensive and defensive, is therefore of paramount importance. Whether it is ever used or not, moreover, it is the indispensable shield for all other types of action in the protracted conflict.

#### USE AGAINST THE ENEMY SOME OF THE WEAPONS USED AGAINST US

A strategy for victory in the cold war would, however, begin with a complete reappraisal of present efforts. It would aim to seize the initiative in every possible arena of competition. Not merely the expansion of present projects and the addition of new ones would be considered but how to give each of them a clear role within the framework of the overall objective.

It would not reject courses of action simply because they are unconventional. We would no longer disdain to use against the enemy some of the weapons used against us. Having finally acknowledged that the struggle is decisive and therefore as real as a "real" war, we would not hesitate to fight fire with fire.

American ingenuity would be called upon to evolve devices and techniques to exploit weaknesses and vulnerabilities in the Communist world, to keep the enemy constantly off balance, to impose upon him problems and crises instead of always waiting to counteract crises of his making. By all the instruments of communication and through the loudspeakers of events, we would aim to saturate the Communist world with reminders that we intend to keep alive the memory of human dignity, the hatred of injustice, the hope of liberation and the courage needed for resistance.

Debates in the United Nations and at diplomatic conferences would be made sounding boards for our views as well as for theirs. No allusion to "colonialism" would be permitted to pass without our throwing the limelight on Red imperialism and on the principles of self-determination.

Thus the Communist world, rather than ours, would tend increasingly to become the principal battlefield of ideological and political conflict. The immunity their world has so long enjoyed would be shattered.

A bill to establish a Freedom Academy for training cold-war specialists—what a *Life* editorial called a political West Point—is before Congress. Whatever the merits or demerits of this particular bill, it is in line

with a commitment to victory. Various proposals have been made for setting up a liberation force, a volunteer formation drawn largely from among refugees from captive nations and ready to serve in emergencies. That, too, is in line with a strategy for victory. Official and private agencies of other kinds would be generated by focused strategic thinking in offensive rather than defensive terms. And a new department of Cabinet rank could and should be established to plan and coordinate all cold-war activities.

#### WE WOULD HAVE TO EMBRACE THE GRIM BUT INSPIRING REALITIES OF OUR EPOCH

Certainly this new approach would call for substantial sacrifices in material terms. But the notion that it would require a deep cut in American living standards underestimates the wealth and productive genius of our country. The more demanding sacrifices, indeed, would be in the psychological and moral domains. Our people, in short, would have to renounce complacency, euphoria, and illusion; they would have to embrace the grim but inspiring realities of our epoch.

The ultimate rise of a world order under law is dictated by the logic of devastating weaponry, the conquest of space, and modern communications. What remains to be settled is whether it will be an order rooted in freedom or in universal tyranny.

I do not doubt that we have what it takes to assure that it will be an order that we may cherish. The Western concepts of open societies, of liberty under law, of government by the consent of the governed, of the supremacy of the individual rather than the State—these are far closer to the natural aspirations of man than the anthill concepts of communism. In any equal propaganda contest, what these Western concepts have brought in human well-being will become obvious and irresistible to the majority of mankind.

In my 1955 memorandum to the White House I wrote: "Once that decision is made, some of the means for implementing it will become self-evident; others will be explored and developed under the impetus of a clear-cut goal. Agreement on the problem must come before agreement on the solution." But Abraham Lincoln said it better a century ago: "Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we shall find the way."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the proposed legislation would fill the most glaring gap in our whole cold war technique, and would provide a basis and the machinery and the manpower to train those who represent America abroad in the business that they are sent to do, effectively to promote America's interest in the cold war.

We would not send a soldier to fight a battle ill prepared and untrained, without any concept of what his job was. Still, we send all over the world to represent us people from the bureaus and agencies of various institutions of the Government who are skilled in their particular pursuits, but who have never had an opportunity to be trained in the machinations of communism, and what it actually means, and what they can expect as they find Communist operatives all over these areas of the world.

We wonder why, in spite of our expenditures and our sacrifices, victories come all too infrequently for our side in the cold war.

The proposed legislation has excited the imagination and attracted the sup-

port of many writers and editorialists and commentators. I hold in my hand a very recent endorsement published in the San Diego Union of Sunday, August 21, 1960. It is entitled "The Anatomy of Cold War." The subhead reads: "Only by knowing communism, its goals and tactics, can Americans avert conquest by infiltration."

Does anyone dispute that? Does anyone believe that we can win these wars by not understanding communism, by not being trained in how communism operates and what it proposes to do? Can anyone here tonight point to any place in America where one can go to get that education, that training, and that background?

Where can the young career officer go—for example, the agricultural attaché who is heading for Pakistan? Where will he go to learn? Not about agriculture; he knows that. He has attended the State college. He has been an extension agent. He knows about agriculture. He goes to Pakistan as an agricultural attaché because he is a soldier in the cold war. Where will he learn the major lesson? Where will he learn about communism? Where will he learn about what the Communists plan in that particular area of the world? Where will he learn to fortify himself, equip himself, and train himself, so that he can be an effective leader in the cold war? It is not enough that he goes to Pakistan to teach something about agriculture. We squander pretty much the cost of sending people overseas until and unless they are fully trained to do the job. The bill provides that opportunity. That is why the proposed legislation has attracted bipartisan support and national acclaim from every walk of life.

Americans feel that time is late already to train people in government to do the job in the cold war that they are supposed to do.

Someone will say, "Let us send it to another committee. Let it die. We will be back in another 4 months. Then hearings can be held."

That will be 6 months. Then it can find a place on the calendar, and that will be 9 months. How do we know Khrushchev will wait? What will the Communists be doing in the meantime? How much longer can we delay becoming equipped to fight a war which is raging white hot now? Every day we delay increases the danger. Every week we delay increases the cost. Every month we delay increases the probability of a hot war, unless we successfully conclude victories in the cold war.

"The Anatomy of Cold War," published by objective writers in the San Diego Union, is a most persuasive argument for the legislation which I hope the Senate will adopt with unanimity tonight. It lists specifically the weaknesses in our present approach. It bills persuasively the arguments for doing something effective to remove those weaknesses now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in my remarks.



1960

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17077

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## THE ANATOMY OF COLD WAR

(Only by knowing communism, its goals and tactics, can Americans avert conquest by infiltration.)

The cold war is more than a political phrase. It's a reality, and potentially decisive skirmishes are being fought right now, today, this moment. It's as close as a short jet run, measured in geographic terms. Cuba is only 90 miles from the United States. Since the admission of Alaska, the Soviet Union itself is less than 50 miles from our own borders. Over the pole by subsonic jet, Moscow is 7 hours to New York or Detroit. San Francisco is 30 minutes' missile time from Kamchatka Peninsula. San Diego is 20 minutes from a missile-bearing submarine 500 miles at sea.

But the important characteristic of the cold war is not the physical threat, great as that may be.

What is important is that this war could be won without a single shot. It could be won by encirclement—to the point where the United States is helpless. It could be won by nibbling at our own strength and that of our allies—to the point where we and they are exhausted. It could be won by the invisible softening attack—to the point where an entire nation is brainwashed into believing surrender is proper and regimentation is good.

The maps on the first page [not printed in RECORD], and this have been prepared to emphasize the scope and significance of Communist victories and inroads around the world in relation to our own land. A cabinet shakeup in Africa, a general riot in any country along the Mediterranean, an upswing in Communist activity in Rio or Buenos Aires is an alarm signal that Americans cannot ignore.

But, again, the Communist threat, like disease, knows no international boundaries. It can—and is intended to—take its toll from within. "Within" means "within the United States as well as within our alliances."

Three facts are vital to understanding Communist strategy. If you don't recognize them, much that happens in today's world will appear all but inexplicable.

Fact No. 1 is the nature of the Communist's prime target. It is not any geographical area. It is the human mind. Communist dogma acknowledges that the only lasting conquest is the conquest of the human spirit. If you conquer a man's spirit, you don't have to fight with him physically.

Fact No. 2 is the nature of the Communists' political tactics. Perhaps of all the things about the cold war, this is the most difficult for the average American to realize, for most of us have been reared in a climate of Anglo-Saxon and Roman law, melded with American frontier and British Victorian concepts of fairness, "playing the game." The Communist does not achieve his objectives by normal partisan politics. No Marxist believes in nor accepts open debate and free elections.

When the Communist pays lip service to democracy and "people's republics," he is indulging in an ironic twist of words. Communist dogma has no abiding faith in the people. It states repeatedly that a "proletarian" elite must make decisions for the people. What Americans and western allies understand as constitutional and democratic processes are regarded by the Communist as unrealistic.

Realism is permitting a display purporting to be a popular choice only after the election, the cabinet change, the court ruling has been rigged. The Communist only bets on a sure thing, and his tactics are designed to bring that sure thing about. Method doesn't matter.

Fact No. 3 is the nature of Communist timing. The Communists are playing for keeps, and they are willing to take as much time as necessary, fluctuating with the immediate times whenever it is expedient. They have alternated between talk of peace and war since the end of World War II, depending upon what best suited the long-range Communist objective—complete domination of the earth. In fact, the only area in the world today that is not a war zone, from a Communist viewpoint, is Soviet Russia and her satellites. This area covering one-sixth of the earth's land mass is already under Communist control.

Related to this fact of a "protracted struggle" is the very nature of democratic processes. Free choice through free institutions after free discussion can function properly only in a climate of order. The Communists recognize this and go to practically any lengths to maintain a worldwide climate of disorder, violence, and unrest.

This helps explain their jamming of allied broadcasts, their demonstrations in Caracas, Tokyo, and Léopoldville, their barrage of publications into unsettled areas like Latin America, southeast Asia, and Africa.

Mao Tse-tung, ruler of Communist China, is fond of quoting an ancient Chinese militarist, Sun Tzu, who lived in 500 B.C. Sun wrote: "To fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." Mao, in his own "Strategic Problems of China's Revolutionary War," quotes Sun again: "Avoid the enemy when he is full of dash, and strike him when he withdraws exhausted." But perhaps the most pointed is this one, quoted by Mao: "Make a noise in the East, but strike in the West."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the great things about our country is that ideas have a habit of popping up all over and finally finding their way to Washington and getting people to embrace them, understand them, endorse them, and advocate them. One of the men who originated this concept of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy is Allen Grant, of Orlando, Fla. He made a most persuasive witness before the committee. He has worked long with Representative HERLONG, of Florida, Representative Judd, of Minnesota, and other Members of the House who have done Trojan work in this connection; men who, I know, tomorrow will pick up the cudgels and try to induce the House to suspend the rules, as it can tomorrow, to pass the bill, as I hope it will, and send the bill to the President's desk, where I am confident he will sign it, because all Americans want the cold war to be won.

In giving his reasons for favoring the proposed legislation, Mr. Grant testified for the bill more than a year ago, on July 17, 18, and 19, 1959.

This is not a new proposal. It is not something which has suddenly been dropped on the Senate. This is a bill which was introduced in April 1959. Voluminous hearings have been held, and much discussion has taken place. It has been on the Senate Calendar for a long while. We were hopeful that it would be enacted before the recess of Congress for the political conventions. We were hopeful it would be one of the first items of business to occupy our time during this resumed session. However, we are grateful that it is before the Senate today.

However, it is not new; it is not unexpected. If there was any question, such as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] raised, about jurisdiction, that question comes 18 months too late. Certainly we need to move more rapidly than that if we expect to win the cold war, than to wait for 18 months and many days; and then, when it is too late for Senate consideration by any committee, suggest that it be killed by cubbyholing it in another committee a day or two before the adjournment of Congress sine die.

I was about to mention Mr. Grant and his small group of Orlando public-minded, public-spirited citizens, most of them, I suppose—probably all of them—Democrats, who met and decided that it was time, at least in that little community, to try to develop a program which would enable the people of Orlando, as they put it, to know their enemy. So they organized a committee of "know your enemy" speakers.

Mr. Grant said:

This committee believed that as an absolute minimum our high school seniors should be given a broad survey course on world communism (in addition to courses in American history and civic courses to show the advantages of an open society) so they could understand something of the frightful challenge—political, scientific, economic, and military—facing their Nation, and as a result would better understand the unique obligations of American citizenship. Our committee soon learned our high school teachers were not prepared to give such a course, and it was up to us if anything was to be done.

Mr. President, that is not the fault of the high school teacher. Except in a few highly to be congratulated institutions of upper learning in this country, there is no place to which teachers can go to learn the facts about communism which they are expected to teach to the children in the classrooms. Except for a few institutions of higher learning, there is no place to which anyone can go to get this kind of information first hand, authoritatively packaged and prepared, ready for people to understand, ready for them to absorb, ready for them to take out and put into practice as willing soldiers of the cold war. I mention that because, it seems to me, that out of that experience comes a situation of great significance.

Last week in Detroit, addressing the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Allen W. Dulles, Director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, spoke most eloquently about the need for the type of program of which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] has spoken so effectively tonight, and which would be made available by the bill now before the Senate.

I quote a few paragraphs from the remarkable address delivered by Mr. Dulles on that occasion. He said:

We need far and wide in this country more education on the whole history of the Communist movement.

In our schools and colleges we can find many courses in ancient history, in philosophy, courses on the great movements of the past, the conquests of ancient times from Alexander the Great to Napoleon. Courses on Communist theory and practices are few and far between.

17078

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 30

The bill before the Senate moves in the direction of preparing people to teach courses of that type. Mr. Dulles states that in a few higher institutions such courses are available, but he continues:

By and large, however, in our educational institutions, except in the graduate field or in specialized schools and seminars, these subjects are not generally taught.

I have reviewed the curriculums of many of our universities and colleges and, despite a considerable advance in recent years, our students are not yet afforded a broad opportunity to gain the essential background knowledge of Communist history and policy. And we should start this education in our secondary schools.

That is another authoritative voice, the voice of the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, echoing the lament of the people of Orlando, that there is no place where teachers can go to learn the facts that Allen Dulles wants to make available to the children in the high schools. Indeed, we are late in starting such an operation.

Mr. President, I commend to all a reading of the entire speech by Mr. Allen Dulles. It begins on page A6252 of the unbound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 23.

In concluding what I have to say about this matter at this time, let me point out the tremendous disadvantage which we Americans undergo because of our failure to have available to us now the mechanisms provided by this measure, which I have been privileged to sponsor, along with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

In this exchange-of-persons program—the exchange of Russians with Americans, and back and forth, again—we find that when visitors from the Communist countries come to our country, they come here as agents, many of them as agents provocateur. Some of them are spies, but all of them are agents. All of them are trained in communism, understand communism, and believe in communism; and they are also trained in our way of life, after having studied it for many years, and they know the strengths and the weaknesses of our way of life, and come here prepared to try to make its weaknesses look larger and its strengths look smaller, and they endeavor to do what mischief they can. And when they return home, they are ready to make propaganda attacks of the kind which their experience here would lead them to believe would be the most effective.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Anyone who has attended an international conference at which representatives of the Communist countries are present understands the point which the Senator from South Dakota is making. All of the representatives of the Communist countries are extraordinarily well prepared to back up the policies enunciated by the Communist bloc. They are all exceptionally dedicated and of one mind.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota rightly stresses the need for thorough training and indoctrination on the part of those teachers who will instruct our young people as to the meaning of communism. In my judgment it is very important that this be taught to our young people in addition to American history and other key subjects relevant to the history and meaning of democracy. I do not think enough American history is presently being taught in our schools. I believe that in addition the meaning of communism should be taught in our schools. This should be done by those who know the subject well and have been properly instructed in it, rather than by persons who have taken it up as a sideline.

I believe that by presenting this bill to us, the Senator from South Dakota has performed an important service.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New York for his very profound, interesting, and effective comments. Certainly what he has said is borne out by everyone who has attended an international conference at which Communists have been present. The Communists send their best trained people there; and every one of them who attends such conferences, whether he be a smiling Mikoyan or a scowling Gromyko, goes there knowing full well what he seeks to do. When the Russian farmers came to this country, I suspect that some of them had had experience on farms, but I feel sure that all of them had had thorough instruction in a training school in the Lenin Institute, so that they knew the Communist line, the Communist propaganda approach, the Communist attack on Christianity, and the Communist attack upon capitalism. They came here prepared, equipped, and ready to try to pick flaws in our system and to try to advance arguments in behalf of the system they represent.

On the other hand, when Americans are sent to Russia, whom do we send? We send good Americans, but not one of them in a hundred is as well informed about communism as the most stupid emissary from Russia is informed about our way of life before he ever leaves his homeland.

Mr. President, if one is unprepared, how can he win in such a fight? Without thorough preparation it is impossible to win a tennis match or a baseball game or a fisticuffs match, or the contests at the Olympics which now are being held in Rome. One can do well only when he is well equipped, understanding, and knowledgeable; and the Communist countries take great pains to send such well-trained representatives to our country to represent them.

The pending measure provides for machinery of that kind—by calling for the establishment of a Freedom Commission, which, in turn, will establish a Freedom Academy, where those who are presently in the service of our Government will be trained to represent us in the future. They will receive training in regard to the things they need to know in order to be able to fight effectively in the cold war and to represent us well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask particularly that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DONN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] listen to its reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed agreement will be read.

The proposed agreement was read, as follows:

## UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, August 31, 1960, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1689) to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one-half hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed agreement?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and let me say that I desire to ask some questions, for purposes of clarification—I wish to state, speaking as one Senator who is vitally interested in this proposed legislation, that it is my purpose to cooperate in every possible way to expedite the prompt taking of action on the bill, and I am very hopeful that we can shorten the time allowed for its further consideration to such an extent—if that will be agreeable to the Senate—that we may be able to act on this measure tonight, so that if it is passed tonight by the Senate—as I hope and as I believe it will be—the House will have that much additional time in which to act on the bill. That is important, because the House already is confronted with a crowded agenda.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We could shorten the time limitation proposed, if that is desired. But in view of the fact that the American Bar Association is holding its annual meeting in this city, quite a number of Senators are not in the Chamber at the moment. So we thought the proposed agreement, as read at the desk, would be one way to speed up the further consideration of the bill and the taking of action on it.

Mr. MUNDT. At what time is it proposed that the Senate convene tomorrow?

1960

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17079

Mr. MANSFIELD. At 10 a.m.; and tonight the Senate will adjourn, for the benefit of the Senator from New York.

On tomorrow, the House will not convene until 12.

Mr. MUNDT. Will it be agreeable to have an understanding that this measure will be the first order of business tomorrow, following the morning hour?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MUNDT. What is the likelihood of its being set aside, for the consideration of other matters, until later tomorrow afternoon, perhaps?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Aside from a conference report during the morning—and I believe that the chances for that are very slim—I believe the further consideration of this bill is likely to be concluded at noon, at the latest.

If agreeable, I shall propose that the time available for debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal be 15 minutes, to be equally divided, and that the time available for debate on the bill itself be one-half an hour, also to be equally divided.

Mr. MUNDT. That is agreeable to me. That would be agreeable to me, so far as time is concerned.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, am I to understand the time would be 15 minutes to a side on motions to recommit or amendments, and then 1 hour a side on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Twenty minutes on a motion to recommit or amendments, and a half hour on the bill itself.

Mr. DODD. I do not know how many Senators want to be heard.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I, of course, defer to the Senator from South Dakota, but it occurs to me that it would be the feeling of the Senator from South Dakota that this is a very brief time on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The shortening of the time was in consideration of the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota, and the idea was to be cooperative.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my suggestions were based on the premise that perhaps we could complete action on the bill tonight. The acting majority leader seems to be faced with a situation that a good many Members of the Senate are away at the American Bar Association. Therefore, I do not suppose it would make any difference whether the time might be a little longer or a little shorter. I thought if we could consider it tonight and act, by having a shorter time on it, Senators could get away earlier. But if the Senator prefers another time limitation, it is all right with me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I prefer the latter suggestion, with the proviso that a motion to recommit would be confined to 20 minutes, with one-half hour on the bill itself. In view of the discussions which have taken place, I think that time would be sufficient.

I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no desire to be heard on this bill, so far as I know, but if

a bill which is so important is going over until tomorrow, it seems to be unseemly to have only 10 minutes on a side. I certainly hope the majority leader will keep to his original request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is perfectly all right. I was doing what the Senator from South Dakota desired.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from South Dakota said if it were going over until tomorrow there would be no point in limiting the time to that extent. Ten minutes more or less should not make any difference.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I suggest that the acting majority leader make his request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I renew the original request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Chair restate the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was 30 minutes on amendments and motions, and so forth, and 1 hour on the bill itself.

Is there objection?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is this bill so important that we must take action tonight?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was hopeful that we could take action tonight, but I understand the leadership has problems. I know the American Bar Association is in town.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Idaho is always cooperative.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, and we hope he is going to be that way tonight.

I ask the acting majority leader, who was also at one time a Member of the House—my memory of the rules of the House is rusty—if in the closing days of the session, even though the Senate acted tomorrow, the House could still suspend the rules and could act on the bill on the day it passed the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It certainly would be within the rules of the House to suspend the rules if it saw fit.

Mr. MUNDT. Then we have nothing to lose by waiting until tomorrow, so I hope the Senator from Idaho will concur.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to keep the record straight, the House can suspend the rules in the last 6 days after a sine die resolution.

Mr. KEATING. There has not been any yet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But it is my understanding that the House can consider a bill under suspension of the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL  
10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After consultation with the minority leader, I announce for the information of Senators that there will be no more votes tonight.

## THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the past 8 years have been characterized by extreme tensions in the Middle East. Armed conflict involving two of our major allies erupted over the operation of the Suez Canal. We ourselves dispatched troops to Lebanon in order to maintain order.

The recent assassination of the Premier of Jordan is an outgrowth of the seething turmoil which pervades the entire area and which continues to constitute a serious threat to peace.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have watched these developments with growing concern. Last fall, together with the able junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], I visited the Middle East. We had an opportunity to talk privately with many political leaders in the area, including Prime Minister Ben-Gurion of Israel and President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. These conversations served to emphasize the seriousness of the basic problems which trouble the area. But also, Mr. President, from these conversations I concluded that progress, perhaps very significant, is possible if we but follow the correct approach. I am constrained to believe that the junior Senator from Wyoming reached a similar conclusion.

I was encouraged that, after lengthy discussion, both Mr. Ben-Gurion and Mr. Nasser separately indicated a willingness to negotiate through an intermediary for the solution of the thorny Palestinian refugee problem. Mr. Ben-Gurion preferred the United States, while Mr. Nasser felt that use of the United Nations for this purpose would be more appropriate, but neither seemed adamant on the identity of the intermediary. I regarded as highly significant the fact that both appeared receptive to the idea of negotiations on this one problem without making such negotiations conditional upon an overall settlement of all the problems of the Middle East.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to my distinguished friend from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I compliment my colleague on the statement he is submitting here tonight on the very difficult question of the refugee problem in the Middle East; but in particular I think it is well to underscore for the Senate that the refugee question is deteriorating, has been deteriorating now for 10 years, and in this state of deterioration it has created an explosive situation in the

August 30

Near East that goes far beyond the matter of a quarrel between the Israelis and the Arabs in that part of the world.

It is so explosive, and the power balance is so delicate, that an explosion of the kind we read of yesterday in Jordan may infect the rest of the world with its consequences. It could even trigger the much larger explosion we all fear. For that reason it is no longer simply a refugee question in an isolated portion of the globe, but it is one which affects all the peoples of the world and concerns all governments.

The question must now be approached as one of world-shaking proportions rather than one of dealing with unfortunate human beings in a narrow part of the world.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator. Does the Senator share with me the feeling that this is a dangerous world tinder-box?

Mr. McGEE. It is dangerous beyond the control of the leaders of any one government in that area. Whereas it was viewed as a personal quarrel, it in fact became much like the dropping of a pebble in the lake—the ripples kept spreading out further and further. As a result, with the concern of the Soviet Union in one part of that portion of the world and the concern of the non-Communist countries in the other part, there was a delicate balance which could be easily disturbed and fearfully disrupted, to the point of open warfare of much greater magnitude than we have been witnessing between Israel and the Arabs.

Mr. GORE. I thank my friend.

The Palestinian refugee question is, of course, but one of the many problems which plague the Middle East. It is a question upon which the position of both sides is strongly influenced by emotions. To many, it operates as a psychological block to progress on all other issues. In my opinion, it represents the key with which the door to other solutions may be unlocked. I am convinced that unless and until this, one of the great human tragedies of our time, is satisfactorily resolved, little progress can be made in bringing about political stability and improving economic conditions in the Middle East.

Unless at least a beginning can be made at resolving the refugee problem, we can but anticipate a succession of incidents such as the recent occurrence in Jordan, increased unrest, the hurling of charge and countercharge, and the constant danger of the outbreak of armed hostilities.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will my colleague again yield?

Mr. GORE. I gladly yield.

Mr. McGEE. Speaking for myself, I think I share the view with the Senator that the single most important impression, next to the explosive capability of that situation, was how much a settlement in that part of the world depended upon the resolution of the refugee question.

Mr. GORE. Even an approach to a settlement.

Mr. McGEE. One could not get the opposing factions to sit down to talk about water, about the Suez, or about

many other difficult questions affecting boundary lines which concern them, because there was a psychological block which stemmed from the bitterness, the hatred, and the deterioration resulting from the entire refugee question.

As the Senator has said so well, it was our opinion that unless and until the refugee issue could be removed, we could not approach rationally a useful discussion of the other questions.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. As the Senator will recall, it was only after long negotiation and persuasion that we obtained the assent of the two leaders to whom I have referred to negotiate with an intermediary on the refugee problem as separate and apart from the economic, the political, the geographic, and the many other questions which permeate this troubled area.

Mr. McGEE. I think it was impressive that in these discussions to which the Senator referred, the political sensitivity on both sides on the question of the refugees was such that most of the leaders in those regions dared not appear to be discussing the problem. It was very delicate, because it had been brought home to them in the minds of the people on both sides. The bias, the prejudice, the emotions were so deeply rooted that this problem has become what we might call a political hot potato. Unless the blindness which passions evoke can be eased, a useful negotiation on the other matters cannot be had, because, in my judgment, it will not focus upon the problem which, if solved, has the greatest chance to do the most good. I refer, of course, to relieving the refugee pressure.

Mr. GORE. We have discussed this problem with many people, and we have seen it with our own eyes.

I reached the conclusion, which I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming shares, that if the human tragedy could be separated from the other problems and dealt with apart, if we could obtain an agreement to begin treating this as an identifiable separate problem, great progress could be made.

When, separately, Premier Ben-Gurion and President Nasser acceded to our earnest entreaty in this regard, I felt greatly encouraged, and I know my colleague felt greatly encouraged.

I do not know with what vigor these discussions were pursued by the State Department. As the able Senator knows, our discussions were reported to the State Department in detail.

As the 86th Congress draws to a close, and particularly in view of the outbreak of violence in Jordan, I feel it incumbent upon me publicly to express my regret that the administration has not successfully prosecuted a program of action designed to break the stalemate and to bring about a peaceful solution of political and economic controversy in this area which lies at the crossroads of the world.

Mr. President, the stakes in the Middle East are high. Nowhere is the challenge to freedom and democracy more acute. Nowhere are the demands on free world leadership more exacting.

If the United States is to discharge its responsibilities for leadership, it must act in a manner commensurate with the

task before it. Here is a task which demands to the fullest the prestige, the power, and the influence of the office of the President of the United States. The settlement of the controversy in the Middle East has not been, and cannot be, successfully accomplished by relegating it to the category of problems for the attention of officials at secondary levels of government. A downgrading of the problem can but make its solution unattainable.

On August 27, in a message to the Zionist Organization of America, meeting in New York City, Vice President Nixon stated:

The time has come when we should try to bring about an overall settlement of the Palestine question in all its aspects.

I do not argue the question that "the time has come." In fact, the need for leadership and action has been with us throughout the years of the Eisenhower administration.

I am genuinely concerned, Mr. President, with the manner in which Vice President Nixon proposes, if elected, to bring about the solution, the need for which he now recognizes as being acute. I quote from his message, as follows:

For that reason, I intend if elected President to give this problem the highest priority by assigning primary responsibility for directing negotiations in this field to a man who has so magnificently demonstrated at the United Nations that he is one of the skilled diplomats of our times—my running mate, Henry Cabot Lodge.

Now, it is not my purpose today, Mr. President, to belittle or otherwise characterize the abilities of Mr. Lodge in the field of diplomacy. It is to be noted that he has been an active participant in the formulation and implementation of Middle East policies which have proven singularly ineffective. He is identified with policies which led us to the incongruous position of siding with the Soviet Union and against Great Britain, France, and Israel in the United Nations. He is a part of a record characterized by reaction rather than action, by unsuccessful rather than successful policies.

Now, Mr. Lodge's relative qualifications for the office he seeks are an appropriate subject for discussion. I shall, however, reserve that subject for some other occasion.

Of far greater importance than any question of Mr. Lodge's individual ability as a diplomat is the announcement of Mr. Nixon, if elected, as to how he proposes to discharge the constitutional responsibilities of the Presidency in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, especially, I should say, in the Middle East.

Under the Constitution, there can be but one person upon whom rests the "primary responsibility" for U.S. foreign policy. That person is not the Vice President, but the President. All the world so understands it.

Mr. Nixon proposes, if elected, to turn over to his Vice President the "primary responsibility" for bringing about a solution to the Palestinian problem. Whether or not other problems such as that of Berlin and Germany would also be turned over to Mr. Lodge, or to someone else, is unclear.